



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness: a population-level cohort study

Citation for published version:

Lone, NI, Lee, R, Salisbury, L, Donaghy, E, Ramsay, P, Rattray, J & Walsh, TS 2019, 'Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness: a population-level cohort study', *Thorax*, vol. 74, no. 11, pp. 1046-1054. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210822>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210822](https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210822)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Thorax

Publisher Rights Statement:

This is the author's peer-reviewed manuscript as accepted for publication.

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Predicting risk of unplanned hospital readmission in survivors of critical illness: a population-level cohort study

Nazir I Lone PhD^{1,2}, Robert Lee MSc², Lisa Salisbury PhD^{1,3}, Eddie Donaghy PhD^{1,4}, Pamela Ramsay PhD^{1,5}, Janice Rattray PhD⁶, Timothy S Walsh MD^{1,2,4}

1 University Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care, and Pain Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4SA, UK.

2 Usher Institute for Population Health Sciences and Informatics, University of Edinburgh, Teviot Place, Edinburgh, EH8 9AG, UK.

3 Queen Margaret University Edinburgh, Queen Margaret Drive, Musselburgh, EH21 6UU, UK.

4 MRC Centre for Inflammation Research, University of Edinburgh, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4TJ, UK.

5 Edinburgh Napier University, 219 Colinton Rd, Edinburgh EH14 1DJ, UK.

6 School of Nursing and Health Sciences, University of Dundee, 11 Airlie Place, Dundee, DD1 4HJ

Corresponding author and institution where work was performed

Dr Nazir Lone, University Department of Anaesthesia, Critical Care, and Pain Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences, University of Edinburgh, 47 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 4SA. Email: nazir.lone@ed.ac.uk Phone: +44 131 242 6395

Word count

3689

Online supplement

This article has an online data supplement.

Key words

Intensive care; critical care; patient readmission; hospitalization; outcome

Abstract

Background

Intensive care unit survivors experience high levels of morbidity after hospital discharge and are at high risk of unplanned hospital readmission. Identifying those at highest-risk before hospital discharge may allow targeting of novel risk reduction strategies. We aimed to identify risk factors for unplanned 90-day readmission, develop a risk prediction model and assess its performance to screen for ICU survivors at highest readmission risk.

Methods

Population cohort study linking registry data for patients discharged from general ICUs in Scotland (2005-2013). Independent risk factors for 90-day readmission and discriminant ability (c-index) of groups of variables were identified using multivariable logistic regression. Derivation and validation risk prediction models were constructed using a time-based split.

Results

Of 55,975 ICU survivors, 24.1% (95%CI 23.7%,24.4%) had unplanned 90-day readmission. Pre-existing health factors were fair discriminators of readmission (c-index 0.63,95%CI 0.63,0.64), but better than acute illness factors (0.60) or demographics (0.54). In a subgroup of those with no comorbidity, acute illness factors (0.62) were better discriminators than pre-existing health factors (0.56). Overall model performance and calibration in the validation cohort was fair (0.65,95%CI 0.64,0.66) but did not perform sufficiently well as a screening tool, demonstrating high false positive/false negative rates at clinically relevant thresholds.

Conclusions

Unplanned 90-day hospital readmission is common. Pre-existing illness indices are better predictors of readmission than acute illness factors. Identifying additional patient-centred drivers of readmission may improve risk prediction models. Improved understanding of risk factors that are amenable to intervention could improve the clinical and cost-effectiveness of post-ICU care and rehabilitation.

Word count: 250

Key points

What is the key question?

What is the relative importance of risk factors for unplanned 90-day readmission in ICU survivors and can those at highest risk of readmission be screened for using risk prediction models?

What is the bottom line?

24.1% of ICU survivors had unplanned 90-day readmission. Pre-existing illness indices were better predictors of readmission than acute illness factors but this was reversed in the subgroup with no recorded comorbidity. Discriminant ability of the overall risk prediction model was fair (c-index 0.65) but the model did not perform sufficiently well as a screening tool at clinically relevant probability thresholds.

Why read on?

The high unplanned hospital readmission rates we report in ICU survivors are similar to those with chronic diseases. We provide a comprehensive evaluation of drivers for readmission and highlight the importance of pre-illness health factors in post-ICU morbidity.

Introduction

Unplanned hospital readmissions within 30 days are estimated to cost the health service in England over £2 billion per year and over \$17 billion per year in US Medicare expenditure.(1, 2) Reduction strategies targeting readmissions have therefore been a focus for policy makers through quality improvement activities and financial penalties.(2, 3) ICU survivors are known to experience increased mortality, use more acute hospital resource and reduced quality of life in the years following hospital discharge.(4-8) This increased morbidity has been termed the ‘post-intensive care syndrome’ and may leave ICU survivors and their care-givers with less resilience to new acute stressors as well as persisting problems related to the acute critical illness.(9)

Unplanned hospital readmission is a potentially useful outcome measure in ICU survivor populations. It is easy to measure in linked information systems, is associated with increased costs, and may reflect the effectiveness of rehabilitation interventions, which are increasingly considered a standard of care following critical illness(10) despite recent conflicting trial evidence.(11) However, the validity of unplanned readmission as an outcome measure requires an understanding of contributing factors, especially those that are potentially modifiable by intervention within survivor populations.

Although statistical models have been developed to predict readmission risk for many hospitalised patient groups,(12-14) none have specifically assessed ICU populations with risk factors related to the critical illness episode e.g. organ dysfunction. An ICU-specific model could potentially identify survivors at high risk, and might enable screening of survivors before hospital discharge in whom to target novel risk reduction strategies.

As part of a mixed-methods programme exploring drivers of unplanned readmission following critical illness(15), we undertook a national cohort study to quantify the proportion of ICU survivors experiencing readmission within 90 days of discharge and identify risk factors for 90-day readmission. We also aimed to develop a risk prediction model and assess its performance as a screening tool to identify ICU survivors at highest readmission risk.

Methods

Approvals

This study gained approval from the Privacy Advisory Committee of NHS National Services Scotland (Reference PAC 12/14). South East Scotland Research Ethics Committee granted a waiver (Reference NR/1403AB5). All data were anonymised and analysed in a safe haven environment.

Study setting and databases

We used a cohort study design. Data sources were linked registries: Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group (SICSAG),(16) Scottish Morbidity Record of acute hospital admissions (SMR01), Scottish death records, acute psychiatric hospital admissions (SMR04), Scottish Cancer Registry, and Scottish outpatient registry (SMR00). The SICSAG audit registry captures all adult general intensive care activity (24 units in 2013) serving a population of around 5 million (4.2 million aged ≥ 16) within Scotland and is subject to regular validation assessments.(17) See Supplement health service setting details.

Participants

The cohort comprised Scottish residents aged ≥ 16 admitted to and discharged from general ICUs in Scotland (01/01/2005-31/12/2013) who survived to hospital discharge. For analyses to identify predictors of readmission, the whole cohort was used. For analyses relating to the risk prediction model construction, a time-based partition of the dataset was used to create two groups: discharge from index hospital stay 01/01/2005-17/01/2012, derivation cohort (70%); 18/01/2012-31/12/2013, validation cohort (30%). For analyses demonstrating the performance of the risk prediction model as a screening tool, the validation cohort was used.

Variables

Outcomes: The primary outcome was first unplanned hospital readmission within 90 days of discharge from index hospitalisation. Second and subsequent readmissions were not included. We chose this time-point as the survivorship literature shows a longer period 'at risk', both for increased mortality and hospital resource use.(4-6) 'Unplanned hospital admission' was defined using 'emergency admission' codes in the 'Admission Type' field in SMR01 database (accuracy >93% in validation reports).(18) We also reported a secondary composite outcome of 90d death or unplanned readmission. Follow up was complete, although emigration from Scotland was not recorded. However, emigration in older age groups from Scotland to the remainder of the UK or overseas is known to be low (0.6% of residents aged ≥ 45 years annually).(19)

Predictors: Factors were classified into three groups: demographics; indices of pre-existing patient health; and indices of critical illness severity. See Supplement for additional information relating to variables.

Statistical analysis

Data were analysed using SAS Enterprise Guide v6.1 (SAS Institute,Cary,NC,USA) and Stata v14 (StataCorp LC,Texas,USA). A complete cases analysis was performed for all analyses. Additional information is available in the Supplement. We undertook two separate modelling strategies: one to identify independent predictors of readmission risk and one to develop a risk prediction model.

Univariable/multivariable predictors: Individual univariable associations with the outcome were assessed by entering each variable in a logistic regression model and reporting the odds ratio with 95% confidence interval (95%CI). The c-index was presented to aid interpretation of the predictive ability of each variable. The c-index quantifies the ability of a model to distinguish between patients who experience a readmission and those who do not. A c-index of 0.5 indicates the model performs no better than chance and 1.0 indicates perfect discrimination. However, the c-index may be insensitive when used alone to compare between models. Therefore, to assess the relative

importance of the three pre-defined groups of variables (demographics, indices of pre-existing health, indices of critical illness), the c-index of each group was estimated and observed risk was plotted against equal size deciles of predicted risk. This plot differs from a calibration plot as the deciles of predicted risk are plotted at intervals of equal width on the x-axis rather than at the mean of predicted risk for the decile. Therefore, a steeper upward gradient of observed risk across the x-axis indicates that the group of variables is a better predictor of the outcome than another group. In addition, we presented the classification tables in supplementary material.(20) This illustrates the change in classification of events and non-events when comparing two models. Multivariable associations with the outcome were assessed using logistic regression with no variable selection procedures.

Risk prediction model: We chose a time-based split as this is a stronger design for internal validation than a random split as the former method allows for random variation.(21) Variable selection for the model derivation was performed using backward elimination with a significance level of 0.05 using 70% of the cohort. We assessed model performance by assessing: discriminant ability, assessed by calculating the concordance index (c-index) and presenting a receiver operating characteristics (ROC) curve; calibration, assessed with a calibration plot of predicted probability against observed proportion with the outcome; and overall model performance by calculating Brier's score. We followed best practice and did not apply a statistical test for calibration (e.g. Hosmer-Lemeshow test) nor reported calibration in the derivation dataset.(21) We presented sensitivity and specificity at thresholds of predicted risk to illustrate the ability of the model to be used as a tool to screen patients before hospital discharge.

Subgroup analyses: We repeated multivariable analyses to identify if the relationship between groups of predictors and unplanned readmission differed in two subgroups: patients admitted to ICU on an unplanned basis (excluding those admitted after elective surgery) and patients with no recorded comorbidity. The rationale for this was that patients admitted electively to ICU after

planned surgery may follow recognised pathways post-hospital discharge. Similarly, patients with no previous comorbidity may have different drivers for unplanned readmission which may be more attributable to acute illness rather than pre-existing ill health.

Sensitivity analysis: We performed the following sensitivity analyses:

1. To evaluate if a shorter follow-up period affected the relative importance of the three pre-defined groups of variables, we repeated analyses using 30-day unscheduled readmission as the outcome comparing c-indices and ROC curves between groups.
2. To evaluate the effect of death as a competing risk to readmission, we used two approaches. We repeated analyses with the composite outcome of 90-day death or unplanned readmission, inspecting outcome distribution of death without readmission across categories, univariable odds ratios, and risk prediction model performance. However, this approach gives equal value to death and readmission in the outcome. Therefore, we also used Fine and Gray competing risk regression models to identify independent predictors of time to unscheduled readmission within 90 days which explicitly accounts for the competing risk of death. We evaluated the relative importance of groups of variables by reporting change in Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), a measure of model fit (lower values indicate better fit).
3. To evaluate the effect of representation of comorbidities, we repeated the multivariable analysis replacing count of comorbidities with individual comorbidities.

Results

In total, 55,975 patients were admitted to ICUs and discharged alive (eFigure 1). Median age was 60yrs (IQR 45,71), and patients living in the most deprived regions were over-represented (49.2% resident in two most deprived quintiles, 40% in general population) (Table 1; eTable 1). Pre-existing illness and morbidity was prevalent: 31.3% had an unplanned admission during the previous year;

56.4% had at least one comorbidity. Previous alcohol-related (10.8%) and drug-related morbidity (7.0%) were prevalent (eTable 1). The commonest admission diagnosis was pneumonia (8.4%).

Of 55,975 patients, 13,471 (24.1%,95%CI 23.7%,24.4%) experienced unplanned 90d readmission (Figure 1). A further 712 (1.3%,95%CI 1.2%,1.4%) died without being admitted. 14,183 patients (25.3%,95%CI 25.0%,25.7%) experienced 90d readmission/death). An additional 1015 (1.8%, 95%CI 1.7%,1.9%) died within 90 days, but these deaths occurred after an unplanned readmission.

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of patients and number experiencing 90 day unplanned hospital readmission

For full version of baseline characteristics table and missing data, see eTable 1. Unplanned readmission proportions for continuous variables are presented in eTable 2.

Demographics	Category	Number with characteristic n(%) or median (IQR)	Number with 90d unplanned readmission n(%)
Sex	Female	24466 (43.7)	5952 (24.3)
Age at admission to ICU (years)	Median and Quartiles	60 (45, 71)	-
Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation	First quintile (Most deprived)	14809 (26.5)	3810 (25.7)
	Second quintile	12907 (23.1)	3182 (24.7)
	Third quintile	11269 (20.1)	2645 (23.5)
	Fourth quintile	9631 (17.2)	2129 (22.1)
	Fifth quintile (Least deprived)	7328 (13.1)	1699 (23.2)
Remoteness of residence	Urban area	37469 (68.1)	9321 (24.9)
	Accessible	13271 (24.1)	2974 (22.4)
	Remote or Very remote	4294 (7.8)	965 (22.5)
Indices of pre-existing patient health			
Admissions/attendances in year prior to index hospital stay			
Number of unplanned inpatient admissions	0	38429 (68.7)	7494 (19.5)
	1	10582 (18.9)	2968 (28)
	2 or more	6964 (12.5)	3009 (43.2)
Number of elective inpatient and day case admissions	0	37770 (67.5)	8395 (22.2)
	1	4286 (7.7)	1203 (28.1)
	2 or more	13919 (24.9)	3873 (27.8)
Number of new outpatient attendances	0	27134 (48.5)	5889 (21.7)
	1 or more	28841 (51.5)	7582 (26.3)
Number of acute psychiatric admissions	0	54703 (97.7)	13079 (23.9)
	1 or more	1272 (2.3)	392 (30.8)
Number of comorbidities present	0	24420 (43.6)	4214 (17.3)
	1	17490 (31.2)	4419 (25.3)
	2 or more	14065 (25.1)	4838 (34.4)
Indices of critical illness severity			
Type of admission to ICU	Elective surgery	15553 (28)	3480 (22.4)
	Emergency surgery	13222 (23.8)	3323 (25.1)
	Non-operative	26798 (48.2)	6576 (24.5)
APACHE II score at admission to ICU	Median and Quartiles	15 (11, 20)	-
Mechanical ventilation during ICU stay	Yes	33447 (60.2)	8116 (24.3)
Renal replacement therapy during ICU stay	Yes	3925 (7.1)	1170 (29.8)
Cardiovascular system support during ICU stay	Yes	20101 (36.2)	5174 (25.7)
Maximum number of organs supported on any day during ICU stay	0	17877 (32.2)	4070 (22.8)
	1	20969 (37.8)	5032 (24)
	2	14277 (25.7)	3638 (25.5)
	3	2407 (4.3)	649 (27)
Length of ICU stay (days)	Median and Quartiles	2 (1, 4)	-
Length of index hospital stay (days)	Median and Quartiles	15 (8, 31)	-

Predictors of 90-day unplanned hospital readmission

Patient demographics

In univariable analyses, all demographic factors other than sex had statistically significant associations with readmission risk (older age, social deprivation, remoteness of residence (eTable 2)). As a combined group, the c-index was 0.54 (95%CI 0.54,0.55), indicating weak discriminant ability (Figure 2).

Indices of pre-existing patient health

Prior health resource use and comorbidities demonstrated better discrimination for readmission risk. The number of previous unplanned inpatient admissions was associated with readmission rates from 19.5% (95%CI 19.1%,19.9%) (zero admissions) to 70.2% (95%CI 66.6%,73.6%) (6 or more) (eTable 2; c-index 0.60). Pre-existing comorbidities demonstrated moderate discrimination overall (c-index 0.60). In those experiencing an unplanned 90-day readmission, 68.7% (95%CI 67.9%,69.5%) had at least one comorbidity. All individual co-morbidities were associated with increased risk (eFigure 3A, greatest risk: renal disease, moderate/severe liver disease, diabetes with complications with >40% risk). As a combined group, indices of pre-existing health and resource use demonstrated moderate discrimination (c-index 0.63,95%CI 0.63,0.64) which was the highest compared with the other two groups (Figure 2, $\chi^2=389, 2df, p<0.001$). This was reflected in improvement in the classification of patients not experiencing a readmission of 31.5% and 10.7% in comparison to demographics and critical illness severity indices respectively at the expense of worse reclassification of patients experiencing a readmission (-18.2% and -6.1% respectively) (eTables 3a and 3b).

Indices of critical illness severity

Overall, diagnostic category (c-index 0.57) and APACHE II score (c-index 0.55) were weak discriminators (eTable 2). Some specific diagnostic categories were associated with high readmission risk (variceal bleed (45.8%; 95%CI 41.3%,50.4%) and pancreatitis (40.0%; 95%CI 36.1%,44.1%)). Organ support variables were weak discriminators of 90-day readmission (c-index range 0.51-0.52).

Similarly, length of post-ICU hospital stay and overall length of hospital stay were weak discriminators (c-index 0.52-0.56). As a combined group, the c-index for indices of critical illness severity was 0.60 (95%CI 0.60,0.61) (Figure 2).

Multivariable analyses

In multivariable analyses, number of previous unplanned admissions was strongly associated with risk of 90-day readmission, with a predicted absolute risk increase from 20.3% (95%CI 19.9%,20.8%) in those with no previous readmissions to 61.1% (95%CI 57.7%,65.5%) in those with 6 or more (OR 6.19,95%CI 5.12,7.49) (eTable 4). Readmission risk increased with comorbidity count, from 19.5% (no comorbidities;95%CI 18.8%,20.1%) to 34.5% (5 or more;95%CI 30.6%,38.5%). Replacing comorbidity count with individual comorbidities revealed seven individual comorbidities no longer retained statistical significance (eFigure 3B). Several other factors remained statistically significant, but the gradient of readmission risk across categories was less pronounced; these included age, type of admission to ICU, and length of post-ICU hospital stay. Several specific diagnoses were independently associated with predicted risk substantially higher than the population mean, namely oesophageal variceal bleed (33.5%, 95%CI 28.8%,38.1%) and pancreatitis (38.4%, 95%CI 34.0%,42.7%). Several factors were not significant predictors in multivariable analysis, including socioeconomic status, APS, and ICU length of stay.

Risk prediction model

In the derivation cohort (n=33294, eTable 5), the overall discriminant ability of the model was fair (c-index 0.67,95%CI 0.66,0.67) and overall performance was acceptable (Brier's score 0.170). In the validation cohort (eTable 6), discriminant ability and overall performance were similar (c-index 0.65,95%CI 0.64,0.66; Brier's score 0.176; Figure 3). Model calibration across the range of predicted risk in the validation cohort was reasonable although the model slightly under-predicted readmission risk (mean observed risk 25.0%; mean predicted risk 23.6%) (eFigure 4).

Performance of risk prediction model as a screening tool

The model's performance as a screening tool is illustrated using the validation cohort in Table 2 (see eTable 7 for 95%CI). Assigning $\geq 20\%$ predicted probability of the outcome as the threshold to 'screen positive' would lead to the majority (54.2%, 95%CI 53.4%,55.0%) of patients screening positive with a 30.7% (95%CI 29.2%,32.3%) false negative rate and a 49.2% (95%CI 48.2%,50.1%) false positive rate. Increasing the threshold to $\geq 50\%$ improves the probability of identifying a patient who will subsequently experience a readmission but a substantially smaller proportion of the population screen positive (decreasing to 1.6%, 95%CI 1.4%,1.8%). eTable 8 illustrates the patient characteristics and outcomes of those who would screen positive compared with those who would screen negative at two probability thresholds ($\geq 20\%$ and $\geq 50\%$).

Table 2 Performance of risk prediction model as a screening tool to identify patients at risk of unplanned hospital readmission

See eTable 7 for 95% confidence intervals.

Threshold of predicted risk for screening positive	Number (%) screening positive	Sensitivity & False Negative Rate (%)	Specificity & False Positive Rate (%)	Positive Predictive Value (%)	Negative Predictive Value (%)	Positive Likelihood Ratio	Negative Likelihood Ratio
$\geq 20\%$	7,734 (54.2)	69.3 / 30.7	50.8 / 49.2	31.9	83.3	1.41	0.60
$\geq 30\%$	2,806 (19.7)	32.6 / 67.4	84.7 / 15.3	41.4	79.1	2.13	0.80
$\geq 40\%$	1,129 (7.9)	16.7 / 83.3	95.0 / 5.0	52.7	77.4	3.35	0.88
$\geq 50\%$	484 (3.4)	8.6 / 91.4	98.3 / 1.7	63.2	76.4	5.17	0.93
$\geq 60\%$	226 (1.6)	4.4 / 95.6	99.4 / 0.6	69.0	75.8	6.74	0.96

The likelihood ratio for a positive screening test result is the ratio of the true positive rate to the false positive rate. Larger values of the positive likelihood ratio (greater than 1) indicate better performance of the screening test at obtaining positive screening test results in patients who experience a readmission in comparison with those who do not experience a readmission. The likelihood ratio for a negative screening test result is the ratio of the false negative rate to the true negative rate. Smaller values of the negative likelihood ratio (less than 1) indicate better performance of the screening test at obtaining negative screening test results in patients who do not experience a readmission in comparison with those who do experience a readmission. Equations: Sensitivity = True Positive Rate; $1 - \text{Sensitivity} = \text{False Negative Rate}$; Specificity = True Negative Rate; $1 - \text{Specificity} = \text{False Positive Rate}$; Positive Likelihood Ratio = True Positive Rate / False Positive Rate = Sensitivity / $(1 - \text{Specificity})$; Negative Likelihood Ratio = False Negative Rate / True Negative Rate = $(1 - \text{Sensitivity}) / \text{Specificity}$

Subgroup analyses

In the subgroup of patients admitted to ICU on an unplanned basis (n=40020; unplanned hospital readmissions n=9899, 24.7%, 95%CI 24.3%, 25.2%), results were similar to the full cohort. The three groups of variables had similar patterns of association compared with the full cohort (eFigure 5A and 6A, eTable 9). In the subgroup of patients with no previous comorbidity (n=24420; unplanned readmissions n=4214, 17.3%, 95%CI 16.8%, 17.7%), indices of critical illness severity had the greatest discriminant ability (c-index 0.622) (eFigure 5B and 6B, eTable 9).

Sensitivity analysis

Similar results were found using 30-day unscheduled readmission as the outcome: indices of pre-existing patient health retained the highest discriminant ability (c-index 0.617 vs 0.601 critical illness indices vs 0.535 demographics; $\chi^2=304, 2df, p<0.001$) (eFigure 2; eTable 9).

The small proportion of deaths without a preceding unplanned readmission that occurred in individuals was relatively balanced across covariates in the derivation cohort (eTable 2). Both sensitivity analyses using logistic regression models of combined outcome of 90-day death or readmission and time to first unplanned readmission (Fine and Gray regression model) accounting for the competing risk of death (eTable 4) did not substantially differ from the findings of the primary multivariable analysis. Model performance for the combined outcome of 90-day death or readmission was similar (c-index 0.66, 95%CI 0.65, 0.67; Brier's score 0.179). The relative importance of the three groups of covariates was similar for both analyses comparing c-indices of the combined outcome (90d death/readmission) (eFigure 2; eTable 9) and analyses comparing AIC for time to first unplanned readmission (AIC 244863 pre-existing health vs 246039 critical illness indices vs 246909 demographics; full model 244238).

Discussion

In a large, complete population study, we have demonstrated that 1 in 4 ICU survivors experience an unplanned readmission within 90 days of hospital discharge. Indices of pre-existing ill health were more strongly predictive of readmission than indices of critical illness severity in the whole cohort, but this was reversed in subgroup analyses of patients with no recorded comorbidity. A risk prediction model derived from multiple data sources had, at best, only moderate discriminant ability. A screening tool derived from this model is unlikely to perform sufficiently well in isolation to identify cases in whom to target high intensity interventions aimed at reducing readmissions amongst ICU survivors.

Our data indicate unplanned readmission rates among ICU survivors are substantially higher than the general hospital population (30 day readmission 14.7% in ICU survivors vs 7.0% in all hospital inpatients(22)). Unplanned readmission rates are increasingly used as a quality indicator and target for improvement.(23, 24) Although many variables had statistically significant associations with readmission risk, almost all had limited discriminant power as individual factors. A key finding was that ICU-related factors such as organ support are not independently associated with readmission risk among survivors. In contrast, pre-existing health factors had the greatest predictive power of all variables. However, in the subgroup of patients with no pre-existing comorbidity, indices of critical illness had greater discriminant power than pre-existing health factors. These findings are consistent with pre-critical illness chronic health being the dominant factor *at a population-level* in general critical care survivors in determining post-ICU health trajectories, whereas new impairments that follow an ICU admission may be more dominant in subgroups with no comorbidity.(25-27)

Addressing recovery from critical illness from this perspective has important implications for research, policy, and service design given the high prevalence of older patients with comorbidity in critical care populations.(4, 6) For example, it may explain the lack of effect on clinical outcomes from rehabilitation interventions focussed mostly on physical therapy alone,(7) and also questions

the rationale for using outcomes such as longer term hospital costs and HRQoL in critical care trials without accounting for pre-illness health status.

Our model had a similar discriminant ability compared with other published risk prediction scores used in general hospitalised populations (c-indices of studies using retrospective administrative data 0.55-0.72)(28). This was despite inclusion of ICU-related/acute factors. These findings may be explained by our datasets not including important factors associated with readmission risk, such as social and organisational factors identified in a systematic review.(28) Research in other populations highlights the importance of these factors, which have not previously been well-addressed in ICU survivor populations. For example, family stress,(29) lack of information,(30) and frailty(31) could all be important during the early post-hospital period. Furthermore, some patients will experience readmissions due to unpredictable factors which would not be present in exhaustively comprehensive datasets. Analysis of PROFILE's qualitative component, comprising interviews and focus groups with ICU survivors and their carers, may reveal additional insights.(15) Our study clearly shows that additional research is needed to understand other factors driving readmission risk in this population to improve the discriminant value of a clinical decision support tool.

We used 90-day unplanned readmission as our primary outcome, whereas 30-day readmission is widely used in other patient groups.(12, 27, 28, 32) We believe the longer time period is justified because the ICU survivorship literature shows a longer period 'at risk', both for increased mortality and hospital resource use.(4-6) In addition, a sensitivity analysis using 30-day readmission as the outcome was similar to the primary outcome. Furthermore, HRQoL typically starts to plateau in ICU survivors after three months(7, 31) and this time point is widely used for primary outcome measurement in critical care trials.(7, 33) Extending the period of interest further risks including readmissions that are less causally related to the critical illness hospitalisation.

Our study has a number of strengths. The database had complete population coverage, included a diverse range of data sources which undergo regular validation, and contained a large number of

events, resulting in unbiased, precise estimates. We undertook sensitivity analyses to explore the effect of death as a competing risk. We reported our risk prediction model using current best practice and undertook internal validation using a recommended time-based split.(21) Other risk prediction scores for readmission have minimised the number of variables to ensure ease of clinical use.(12, 34, 35) We decided *a priori* to pursue a non-parsimonious approach to model building with the intention of electronic implementation.

There are potential limitations to our study. We were unable to access measurements of preadmission functional status, frailty trajectories or biomarkers relating to inflammation, which have been associated with poorer health outcomes following critical illness.(31, 32, 36, 37) Furthermore, we had no data on social care or other non-clinical variables that have been shown to influence readmission risk, for example polypharmacy,(14) or low health literacy.(38) These are not routinely considered in critical care recovery pathways.

Our study has a number of methodological limitations. Whilst a time-based split is a robust method of model validation, secular trends in demographics, clinical practice and healthcare organisation can bias model performance. This may mean time-based validation methods perform worse than methods in which derivation and validation cohorts are drawn from the same time period. In addition, using statistical significance to select variables may have resulted in more complex models than, for example, using change in Bayesian Information Criterion. Furthermore, 12.8% were missing APACHE II scores. This is due to specific APACHE II model exclusions, rather than being 'missing', and these values cannot therefore be imputed. This means our model cannot be generalised to those patients excluded from APACHE II scoring.

Our design did not enable an assessment of the proportion of readmissions that might be avoided through interventions. A recent systematic review estimated the median proportion of avoidable readmissions was 27%.(39) This research question may be better investigated using qualitative methodology, which was the approach used in a parallel part of our research programme.(15)

Understanding the modifiable factors that cause readmissions in critical care survivors is essential for designing effective anticipatory interventions. Developing and testing such interventions requires detailed understanding of the factors that may be important.(40) Whilst we could only report presence of comorbidity, our study suggests optimising chronic disease management is at least as important as strategies specific to the complications of critical illness.

Our results have important implications for future research and policy. The unplanned readmission rates we report in ICU survivors are similar to those with chronic disease currently targeted with specific discharge pathways and community support.(41, 42) Although guidelines promote rehabilitation after critical illness,(10, 43) the most clinically and cost-effective way to deliver these are unknown and evidence-based care pathways do not yet exist, in contrast with other conditions such as myocardial infarction(42) and stroke.(44) Our data support the need for clear pathways with appropriate support for ICU survivors during care transitions, especially from secondary into primary care.

Conclusion

We have demonstrated that 1 in 4 patients experience an unplanned hospital readmission within 90 days of discharge following an episode of critical illness. Pre-existing illness indices are better predictors of readmission risk than acute illness factors at a whole cohort level. In a subgroup of those with no comorbidity, acute illness factors predominate. Identifying additional patient-centred drivers of readmission may improve risk prediction models. Improving our understanding of patient groups and risk factors that are amenable to intervention could improve the clinical and cost-effectiveness of post-ICU care and rehabilitation.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to clinicians in ICUs in Scotland who contribute data to the Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group registry and Information Services Division (ISD Scotland) for providing data and undertaking linkage.

Competing interests

On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

Role of the funding source

The project was funded through a research grant from the Chief Scientist Office for Scotland (reference CZH/401026). The funder had no role in study design; collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the paper for publication. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Authors' contributions

All contributed to conception and design of the work. NL and RL contributed to data acquisition and analysis. All authors contributed to interpretation of data for the work. NL and TW drafted the work. All authors revised it critically for important intellectual content. All authors gave final approval of the version to be published. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Ethical approval

All data relating to patients were anonymised and analysed in a safe haven environment. This study gained approval from the Privacy Advisory Committee of NHS National Services Scotland (Reference PAC 12/14). South East Scotland Research Ethics Committee granted a waiver (Reference NR/1403AB5).

References

1. Jencks SF, Williams MV, Coleman EA. Rehospitalizations among patients in the Medicare fee-for-service program. *The New England journal of medicine* 2009;360(14):1418-1428.
2. NHS Confederation FTN. Briefing: the impact of non-payment for acute readmissions. Feb 2011. 2011 [cited 14/10/2016] Available from: <http://www.chks.co.uk/userfiles/files/The%20impact%20of%20non-payment%20for%20acute%20readmissions%20FINAL%20FOR%20WEB.pdf>
3. Zuckerman RB, Sheingold SH, Orav EJ, et al. Readmissions, Observation, and the Hospital Readmissions Reduction Program. *The New England journal of medicine* 2016;374(16):1543-1551.
4. Lone NI, Gillies MA, Haddow C, et al. Five-Year Mortality and Hospital Costs Associated with Surviving Intensive Care. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2016;194(2):198-208.
5. Hill AD, Fowler RA, Pinto R, et al. Long-term outcomes and healthcare utilization following critical illness--a population-based study. *Critical care (London, England)* 2016;20:76.
6. Wunsch H, Guerra C, Barnato AE, et al. Three-year outcomes for Medicare beneficiaries who survive intensive care. *Jama* 2010;303(9):849-856.
7. Walsh TS, Salisbury LG, Merriweather JL, et al. Increased Hospital-Based Physical Rehabilitation and Information Provision After Intensive Care Unit Discharge: The RECOVER Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA internal medicine* 2015;175(6):901-910.
8. Oeyen SG, Vandijck DM, Benoit DD, et al. Quality of life after intensive care: a systematic review of the literature. *Critical care medicine* 2010;38(12):2386-2400.
9. Needham DM, Davidson J, Cohen H, et al. Improving long-term outcomes after discharge from intensive care unit: report from a stakeholders' conference. *Critical care medicine* 2012;40(2):502-509.
10. Tan T, Brett SJ, Stokes T. Rehabilitation after critical illness: summary of NICE guidance. *Bmj* 2009;338:b822.
11. Connolly B, Salisbury L, O'Neill B, et al. Exercise rehabilitation following intensive care unit discharge for recovery from critical illness. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews* 2015(6):Cd008632.
12. Donze JD, Williams MV, Robinson EJ, et al. International Validity of the HOSPITAL Score to Predict 30-Day Potentially Avoidable Hospital Readmissions. *JAMA internal medicine* 2016;176(4):496-502.
13. Wallace E, Stuart E, Vaughan N, et al. Risk prediction models to predict emergency hospital admission in community-dwelling adults: a systematic review. *Medical care* 2014;52(8):751-765.
14. Donnan PT, Dorward DW, Mutch B, et al. Development and validation of a model for predicting emergency admissions over the next year (PEONY): a UK historical cohort study. *Archives of internal medicine* 2008;168(13):1416-1422.
15. Walsh TS, Salisbury L, Donaghy E, et al. PREventing early unplanned hOspital readmission aFter critical ILInEss (PROFILE): protocol and analysis framework for a mixed methods study. *BMJ open* 2016;6(6):e012590.
16. SICSAG. Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group Annual Report: Audit of Intensive Care Units in Scotland 2016 Reporting on 2015. 2016 [cited 04/10/2016] Available from: <http://www.sicsag.scot.nhs.uk/docs/2016-08-09-SICSAG-Publication-Report.pdf>
17. SICSAG. Scottish Intensive Care Society Audit Group Annual Report: Data Quality. 2017 [cited 06/04/2017] Available from: <http://www.sicsag.scot.nhs.uk/quality/data.html>
18. NSS. Assessment of SMR01 Data Scotland 2014-2015. [Online] 2015 [cited 06/04/2017] Available from: <http://www.isdscotland.org/Health-Topics/Hospital-Care/Publications/2012-05-08/Assessment-of-SMR01Data-2010-2011-ScotlandReport.pdf>
19. Scotland NRo. Migration between Scotland and Overseas. . 2017 [cited 01/05/2017] Available from: <http://www.nrscotland.gov.uk/statistics-and-data/statistics/statistics-by-theme/migration/migration-statistics/migration-between-scotland-and-overseas>

20. Kerr KF, Wang Z, Janes H, et al. Net Reclassification Indices for Evaluating Risk-Prediction Instruments: A Critical Review. *Epidemiology* 2014;25(1):114-121.
21. Moons KG, Altman DG, Reitsma JB, et al. Transparent Reporting of a multivariable prediction model for Individual Prognosis or Diagnosis (TRIPOD): explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162(1):W1-73.
22. Blunt I, Bardsley M, Grove A, et al. Classifying emergency 30-day readmissions in England using routine hospital data 2004–2010: what is the scope for reduction? *Emergency Medicine Journal* 2015;32(1):44-50.
23. Fischer C, Lingsma HF, Marang-van de Mheen PJ, et al. Is the readmission rate a valid quality indicator? A review of the evidence. *PloS one* 2014;9(11):e112282.
24. Press MJ, Scanlon DP, Ryan AM, et al. Limits of readmission rates in measuring hospital quality suggest the need for added metrics. *Health affairs (Project Hope)* 2013;32(6):1083-1091.
25. Iwashyna TJ. Trajectories of Recovery and Dysfunction after Acute Illness, with Implications for Clinical Trial Design. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2012;186(4):302-304.
26. Iwashyna TJ, Netzer G, Langa KM, et al. Spurious Inferences about Long-Term Outcomes. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine* 2012;185(8):835-841.
27. Hua M, Gong MN, Brady J, et al. Early and late unplanned rehospitalizations for survivors of critical illness*. *Critical care medicine* 2015;43(2):430-438.
28. Kansagara D, Englander H, Salanitro A, et al. Risk Prediction Models for Hospital Readmission A Systematic Review. *Jama-Journal of the American Medical Association* 2011;306(15):1688-1698.
29. Cameron JI, Chu LM, Matte A, et al. One-Year Outcomes in Caregivers of Critically Ill Patients. *The New England journal of medicine* 2016;374(19):1831-1841.
30. Deacon KS. Re-building life after ICU: a qualitative study of the patients' perspective. *Intensive & critical care nursing* 2012;28(2):114-122.
31. Bagshaw SM, Stelfox HT, Johnson JA, et al. Long-term association between frailty and health-related quality of life among survivors of critical illness: a prospective multicenter cohort study. *Critical care medicine* 2015;43(5):973-982.
32. Greysen SR, Stijacic Cenzer I, Auerbach AD, et al. Functional impairment and hospital readmission in Medicare seniors. *JAMA internal medicine* 2015;175(4):559-565.
33. Lacroix J, Hébert PC, Fergusson DA, et al. Age of Transfused Blood in Critically Ill Adults. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2015;372(15):1410-1418.
34. Hasan O, Meltzer DO, Shaykevich SA, et al. Hospital Readmission in General Medicine Patients: A Prediction Model. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2010;25(3):211-219.
35. van Walraven C, Dhalla IA, Bell C, et al. Derivation and validation of an index to predict early death or unplanned readmission after discharge from hospital to the community. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 2010;182(6):551-557.
36. Ferrante LE, Pisani MA, Murphy TE, et al. Functional trajectories among older persons before and after critical illness. *JAMA internal medicine* 2015;175(4):523-529.
37. Griffith DM, Lewis S, Rossi AG, et al. Systemic inflammation after critical illness: relationship with physical recovery and exploration of potential mechanisms. *Thorax* 2016.
38. Bailey SC, Fang G, Annis IE, et al. Health literacy and 30-day hospital readmission after acute myocardial infarction. *BMJ open* 2015;5(6):e006975.
39. van Walraven C, Bennett C, Jennings A, et al. Proportion of hospital readmissions deemed avoidable: a systematic review. *CMAJ : Canadian Medical Association journal = journal de l'Association medicale canadienne* 2011;183(7):E391-402.
40. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, et al. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *Bmj* 2008;337:a1655.
41. Hartl S, Lopez-Campos JL, Pozo-Rodriguez F, et al. Risk of death and readmission of hospital-admitted COPD exacerbations: European COPD Audit. *The European respiratory journal* 2016;47(1):113-121.

42. Jones K, Saxon L, Cunningham W, et al. Secondary prevention for patients after a myocardial infarction: summary of updated NICE guidance. *Bmj* 2013;347:f6544.
43. Faculty of Intensive Care Medicine. Guidelines for the Provision of Intensive Care Services. 2015 [cited 14/10/2016]Available from: <https://www.ficm.ac.uk/standards-and-guidelines/gpics>
44. Dworzynski K, Ritchie G, Fenu E, et al. Rehabilitation after stroke: summary of NICE guidance. *Bmj* 2013;346:f3615.

Figure Legends

Figure 1 Cumulative incidence within 90 days of discharge from index hospital stay of (a) unplanned hospital admission and (b) unplanned hospital admission or death

Figure 2 (A) Observed risk of 90 day unplanned hospital readmission by deciles of predicted risk and (B) Receiver operator characteristics for three groups: patient demographics, indices of pre-existing patient health, and indices of critical illness severity.

Within each panel, each point represents 10% of the cohort grouped by their predicted risk of 90 day readmission derived from the group of characteristics labelled by the panel axis label. The observed risk for 'Demographics' variables ranges from 18.2% in the lowest predicted risk decile to 29.4% in the highest. The observed risk for the 'pre-existing health indices' group of variables ranges from 15.3% in the lowest predicted risk decile to 46.9% in the highest. The gradient of the line is therefore steeper. The steeper positive gradient observed for 'Pre-existing health indices' compared with 'Demographics' indicates that there is a greater increase in observed readmission risk for each increment in decile of predicted risk for the group of characteristics, and therefore this group is a better predictor of readmission across the range of predicted risk.

Figure 3 Receiver operator characteristics curve for model predicting unplanned hospital readmission within 90 days of discharge from index hospital stay in the validation cohort (n=14,273)